

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GERARD A MCHALE,

Plaintiff,

V.

SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP,

Defendant.

Case No. 10-cv-04864-JCS

FINAL VERDICT FORM

Dated: September 13, 2013

~~JOSEPH C. SPERO~~
United States Magistrate Judge

1 We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them
2 under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

3 **1. Do you find that Plaintiff GERARD A. McHALE, P.A., TRUSTEE OF THE 1031
4 DEBTORS LIQUIDATING TRUST (the “BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE”), has proved
5 by the preponderance of the evidence that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP was
6 negligent?**

7 Yes No

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

If your answer to Question 1 is “Yes,” please answer Question 2. If your answer to
Question 1 is “No,” do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign
and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.

1 **2. Do you find that BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE has proved by a preponderance of the**
2 **evidence that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP's negligence was a substantial**
3 **factor in causing harm to 1031 Advance?**

4 ____ Yes ____ No

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

If your answer to Question 2 is "Yes," please answer Question 3. If your answer to
Question 2 is "No," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign
and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.

1 **3. What amount of money do you find to be the monetary damage sustained by 1031**
2 **Advance, Inc. which the BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE has proved by the**
3 **preponderance of the evidence?**

4 _____

1 **4. Comparative fault: Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved**
2 **by a preponderance of the evidence that 1031 Advance was negligent?**

3 ____ Yes ____ No

5. Comparative Fault: Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that 1031 Advance's negligence was a substantial factor in causing harm to 1031 Advance?

Yes No

United States District Court
Northern District of California

If your answer to Question 5 is “Yes,” please answer Question 6. If your answer to Question 5 is “No,” please go directly to Question 7.

1 **6. What percentage of responsibility for 1031 Advance's harm do you assign to:**

2 **SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP** _____%

3 **1031 ADVANCE, INC.** _____%

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Please answer Question 7.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

7. Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the criminal conduct of Edward Okun was a superseding cause of 1031 Advance's damage?

Yes No

United States District Court
Northern District of California

DATE _____

SIGNATURE OF FOREPERSON _____